

Serial No. 09/802,680

June 21, 2005

Reply to the Office Action dated February 24, 2005

Page 6 of 8

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 16 and 17.

Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 1-15 are allowed.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoshikawa et al. (U.S. 6,125,041). Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa et al. in view of Young et al. (U.S. 5,596,486).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 16 and 17.

Claim 16 has been amended to recite:

"An information card comprising:  
a first external panel having a ground member disposed therein;  
a second external panel;  
**a circuit substrate including two major surfaces extending substantially parallel to one another and edge surfaces extending between the two major surfaces, the circuit substrate being disposed between the first and second external panels; and**  
**a seat member disposed on the circuit substrate protruding in the direction substantially perpendicular to the two major surfaces of the circuit substrate.**" (emphasis added)

The Examiner alleged that Yoshikawa et al. teaches all of the features recited in claim 16, including "a seat member 25 disposed on the circuit substrate [50] protruding in the direction substantially perpendicular to a [surface] of the circuit substrate."

Claim 16 has been amended to recite the features of "a circuit substrate including two major surfaces extending substantially parallel to one another and edge surfaces extending between the two major surfaces, the circuit substrate being disposed between the first and second external panels" and "a seat member disposed on the circuit substrate protruding in the direction substantially perpendicular to the two major surfaces of the circuit substrate."

Serial No. 09/802,680

June 21, 2005

Reply to the Office Action dated February 24, 2005

Page 7 of 8

The Examiner alleged that element 25 of Yoshikawa et al. corresponds to the seat member recited in Applicant's claim 16. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In contrast to the Examiner's allegation, element 25 of Yoshikawa et al. is specifically disclosed as being a "metal panel," **NOT** a seat member. Thus, at best, element 25 of Yoshikawa et al. corresponds to one of the external panels recited in Applicant's claim 16, and cannot be fairly construed as the "seat member" as recited in Applicant's claim 16.

Therefore, Yoshikawa et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the features of "a circuit substrate including two major surfaces extending substantially parallel to one another and edge surfaces extending between the two major surfaces, the circuit substrate being disposed between the first and second external panels" and "a seat member disposed on the circuit substrate protruding in the direction substantially perpendicular to the two major surfaces of the circuit substrate." At best, Yoshikawa et al. teaches first and second external panels 24, 25, but clearly fails to teach or suggest first and second external panels in combination with a seat member.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoshikawa et al.

The Examiner relied upon Young et al. to allegedly cure deficiencies of Yoshikawa et al. However, Young et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the features of "a circuit substrate including two major surfaces extending substantially parallel to one another and edge surfaces extending between the two major surfaces, the circuit substrate being disposed between the first and second external panels" and "a seat member disposed on the circuit substrate protruding in the direction substantially perpendicular to the two major surfaces of the circuit substrate" as recited in Applicant's claim 16. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Young et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Yoshikawa et al. described above.

Serial No. 09/802,680

June 21, 2005

Reply to the Office Action dated February 24, 2005

Page 8 of 8

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Yoshikawa et al. and Young et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Applicant's claim 16.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is allowable. Claim 17 depends upon claim 16, and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 16 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions the Commissioner for a One-month extension of time, extending to June 24, 2005, the period for response to the Office Action dated February 24, 2005.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 21, 2005

  
Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710

**KEATING & BENNETT LLP**  
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
Telephone: (703) 385-5200  
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080